REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 13, 2008. Claims 1-19 and 21 were pending in that action, and the Examiner rejected all of the claims. With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, and 17 are amended, and the remaining claims are unchanged. Consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully solicited in light of the following comments.

Claim 1:

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that "loading the first control comprises transferring the first control from a computing device storage memory to a computing device addressable memory for execution." This amendment is well supported by the application as originally filed. For example, page 3 line 18 to page 4 line 13 of the specification describes storage memory and addressable memory. Also for example, page 15 line 13 to page 16 line 18 of the specification discusses loading controls into memory and how memory performance is improved by only loading one control at a time.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC §102 as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,811,608 (hereinafter "Stewart"). The Examiner states that Stewart, FIG. 12 and column 19 lines 48-67, discloses the claim 1 limitation of "loading a first control in response to the first selection input." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. The cited sections of Stewart disclose a user selecting a gas from a conventional drop down list. In conventional drop down lists such as those in Stewart, the control for the drop down list is loaded before a user selects the button to generate the list. When a user selects the button to generate a list, the control toggles from the mode of hiding the list to the mode of showing the list. This is different than "loading a first control in response to the first selection input" as is recited in claim 1.

Additionally, as mentioned above, claim 1 has been amended to recite that "loading the first control comprises transferring the first control from a computing device storage memory to a computing device addressable memory for execution." Even if the former claim 1 limitation was anticipated by Stewart, Applicant respectfully contends that this further limitation clearly differentiates claim 1 from Stewart. Stewart only discloses changing a user display (i.e. showing

or hiding a drop down list) in response to an input. Stewart does not disclose transferring a control from a storage memory to an addressable memory for execution in response to an input, as is recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that Stewart does not teach each and every limitation of claim 1 as is required for a rejection under 35 USC §102. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 2:

Claim 2 has been amended to include the limitations that "terminating the first control comprises removing the first control from the computing device addressable memory" and that "loading the second control comprises transferring the second control from the computing device storage memory to the computing device addressable memory for execution." These amendments are well supported by the application as originally filed. The amendments are supported by the same sections cited above in regard to the claim 1 amendment. They are also supported by other sections such as page 17 lines 20-26 of the specification that states "the parent control saves the data associated with the first activated control and activates a different control corresponding to the new point of selection. Accordingly, only one child control is active on the form at a time. In this manner, memory usage and loading time are limited."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 2 as being anticipated by Stewart. Applicant respectfully contends that both of the new limitations differentiate claim 2 from Stewart. First, in regard to the first new limitation, the Examiner states that "terminating" in claim 2 is anticipated by Stewart column 18 lines 61-63 that recites "[u]sing a cursor control device to move the pointer over a chosen project and clicking on the project enters the selected project in the field box 1210 and closes the list." As discussed above in the claim 1 argument, closing a list in a conventional drop down list such as those disclosed in Stewart only toggles the user display. The control is still loaded. Additionally, even if the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's interpretation of Stewart, Stewart does not disclose removing the control from the computing device addressable memory. Stewart does not say what effect if any closing the list has on the computing device memory. Therefore, Stewart does not teach each and every limitation of claim 2 and the 35 USC §102 rejection is improper.

Next, in regard to the second new limitation, the Examiner states that the claim 2 "loading the second control" limitation is anticipated by Stewart FIG. 12 and column 19 lines 48-67. In particular, the Examiner points to the line that recites that "[c]licking on the down arrow button 1230 opens a drop down list of the available purge gases." The new, further limitation recites that the second control is loaded to the computing device addressable memory. This is the same place that the first control is loaded. The items in Stewart that the Examiner is calling controls each have their own distinct boxes in which they display their lists. Stewart does not teach loading to the same place and therefore Stewart does not anticipate the limitation.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 2 is patentable over the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 17:

Claim 17 has been amended to recite a particular order of the steps. This amendment is well supported by the application as originally filed. For example, FIG. 6 and its accompanying text support the amendment.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Stewart. Applicant respectfully contends that Stewart does not teach all of the claim 17 limitations. First, claim 17 recites "terminating the first in control in response to the second user input" and "loading a second control in response to the second user input." In other words, one input, the second user input, is doing two things. It is terminating the first control and loading the second control. Stewart does not have this feature. For example, on page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites an input to field box 1210 as the input that "closes the list" (which is what the Examiner contends is equivalent to the claim 17 terminating), and the Examiner cites an input to arrow button 1230 as the input that "opens a drop down list" (which is what the Examiner contends is equivalent to the claim 17 loading). The input to box 1210 and the input to button 1230 are not the same input. They are two separate inputs. Stewart clearly does not disclose one input that both terminates one control and loads another. Stewart discloses that two inputs are needed.

Additionally, claim 17 now recites a specific order of the steps. Stewart teaches a different order. For example, claim 17 recites that receiving the second user input happens before terminating the first control. Stewart recites the opposite order. Stewart column 18 lines 61-63 recites that the first control is terminated (closing the field box 1210 list) and Stewart column 19 lines 48-49 recites that the second user input is received later (changing gas field box 1228). The claim 17 order is clearly not anticipated by Stewart. Applicant also believes that the order is not obvious in light of Stewart because Stewart teaches away from the order by reciting steps in the opposite order.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 17 is patentable over the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 19:

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Stewart. Applicant respectfully contends that Stewart does not teach all of the claim 19 limitations. Claim 19 recites "wherein each control is configured to be loaded exclusively and not concurrently with another control that has not been terminated[.]" Applicant respectfully contends that Stewart teaches the opposite. Stewart column 89 lines 50-51 recites that "[I]f desired, multiple trial observations sessions from multiple trials can be opened simultaneously and displayed." Stewart column 6 lines 57-59 recites that "[a]lso, preferably, the software allows multiple users to be networked to others via a local access network (LAN) that allows simultaneous access." Applicant respectfully contends that these sections show that either one user could load multiple controls ("multiple trials can be opened simultaneously") or that two users could be loading controls at the same time ("multiple users to be networked . . . that allows simultaneous access"). Claim 19 also includes limitations that have been previously discussed under the claim 1, 2, and 17 arguments. Claim 19 is similarly patentable over Stewart.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 19 is patentable over the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

<u>Claims 3-16, 18, and 21:</u>

Claims 3-16, 18, and 21 are dependent claims. Applicant respectfully contends that these claims are allowable at least based on their dependence upon patentable independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 17, and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. It is also respectfully submitted that claims 3-16, 18, and 21 are patentable at least based on their dependence upon patentable independent claims. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /christopher l holt/
   Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
   Suite 1400
   900 Second Avenue South
   Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
   Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax:(612) 334-3312

CLH:rkp